

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 26-35 are pending in the present application. The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of the present patent application. Further, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-14 and 26-35.

Claims 1-2, 5-14, and 26-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuang (U.S. Patent Publication 20040207604) in view of Enger et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 20050020325). Claims 1-6, 8-14, and 26-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jellicoe (U.S. Patent Number 7,107,018) in view of Enger et al. Claim 7 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Jellico and Enger et al. in view of Pihlaja (U.S. Patent Number 7,009,599).

Response to the Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-14, and 26-35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent claim 1 recites an apparatus that comprises a display for presenting information and a housing connected to the display for supporting the display. Moreover, the apparatus includes a keyboard assembly that comprises a touch sensitive screen keyboard connected through a sliding connection to the housing. The keyboard assembly is deployable in multiple directions. Further, the information presented through the display is oriented based on a direction of deployment of the keyboard assembly.

Chuang teaches a portable electronic device with a concealable keyboard module. Chuang does not teach that the portable electronic device includes a touch sensitive keyboard. In fact, Chuang teaches away from a touch sensitive keyboard. Specifically, at paragraph 19, Chuang teaches that the “keyboard module ... includes a plurality of keys.” Further, at paragraphs 4 and 5, Chuang teaches that using a mechanical keyboard has advantages over a tapping a simulated keyboard presented on a touch-control display module. Accordingly,

Chuang affirmatively teaches away from the inclusion of a touch sensitive keyboard and one of ordinary skilled in the art, when presented with Chuang, would not seek to include a touch sensitive keyboard.

Enger et al. teaches a multi-configurable portable electronic device that includes a keypad. As taught in paragraphs 43 through 46 of Enger et al., the keypad includes a plurality of keys. The keypad of Enger et al. is not a touch sensitive keyboard as recited in claim 1. Moreover, to illustrate the keypad taught by Enger et al., Enger et al. incorporates by reference United States Patent Application 20030058223 (Tracy et al.). FIG. 3 of Tracey et al. shows that the keypad includes a transparent actuator member, element 312. Clearly, the transparent actuator member is a key or button. As such, Enger et al., through the incorporation of Tracey et al., does not teach a touch sensitive keyboard. Further, when Enger et al. is combined with Chuang, the resulting combination of references does not replicate the invention recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited prior art and any claims that depend from claim 1 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

For at least the reasons described above, claims 8, 11, 13, and 14 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Also, any claims that depend from claims 8, 11, 13, and 14 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

Response to the Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-14, and 26-35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Jellicoe teaches a communication device that includes multiple keypads. Jellicoe does not teach the use of a touch sensitive keyboard. Moreover, at column 2, lines 35-37, Jellicoe actually teaches away from a touch sensitive screen keyboard by teaching that the “term ‘keys’, as used in the specification and claims may include keys, buttons and the like.”

As stated above, Enger et al. does not teach a touch sensitive keyboard. As such, when Enger et al. is combined with Jellicoe, the resulting combination of references does not replicate the invention recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited prior art and any claims that depend from claim 1 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

For at least the reasons described above, claims 8, 11, 13, and 14 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Also, any claims that depend from claims 8, 11, 13, and 14 are also patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

Response to the Rejection of Claims 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 which is patentably distinct from the cited prior art. As such, claim 7 is patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Specifically, the combination of Jellico and Enger et al. does not teach an apparatus that includes a touch sensitive keyboard. The further combination of Pihlaja does not cure this deficiency because Pihlaja discloses a mobile phone device wherein a single touch sensitive *display* functions as both the keypad and the display screen. Thus, the combination of Jellicoe and Pihlaja fails to disclose the invention recited in claim 7, because that combination would yield a touch sensitive display and a deployable keyboard with hard keys. In contrast, claim 7, which depends from claim 1, recites a first touch sensitive display and a *second* deployable touch sensitive screen configured as a keyboard. Accordingly, claim 7 is patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

In light of the remarks contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated May 7, 2008

:

By: /Nicholas A. Cole/

Nicholas A. Cole
Reg. No. 60,957
(858) 658-1834

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502